



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

T.G.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/289,043 04/09/99 HICKEY

F 97.845

EXAMINER

IM22/0217

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF
32ND FLOOR
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO IL 60606

GORR, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1711

DATE MAILED:

02/17/00

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/289,043

Applicant(s)

Hickey

Examiner

R GORR

Group Art Unit

1711

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- ☐ This action is FINAL.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1711

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 5,922,779. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the blend of the present invention can contain a broader range of hydrocarbon blowing agent. This broader range still overlaps with the claims of the patent.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Magnus in view of van der Wouden.

5. Magnus discloses the aromatic polyester polyol of the claims (col. 6) comprising 15-40 mole % of phthalic acid material, 40-75 mole % of aliphatic diol and 0.4 to 28 mole % of a

Art Unit: 1711

hydrophobic compound. He discloses using the polyester polyol for making polyurethane foams, and he teaches that the polyester polyol can be blended with other polyols (col. 13, line 14). He differs from the claims by not disclosing hydrocarbon blowing agents.

6. Van der Wouden teaches replacing repacing chlorofluorocarbon (CFC) blowing agents with hydrocarbon blowing agents for the preservation of the ozone layer (page 1, col. 1). He discloses that oleochemical based polyesters with low polarity can be blended with hydrocarbon blowing agents (page 2, col. 1).

7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the CFC blowing agents of Magnus with hydrocarbons to preserve the ozone layer. It's obvious that the aromatic polyols of Magnus would form blends with hydrocarbon blowing agents because van der Wouden teaches that less polar polyester polyols form stable mixtures with hydrocarbons. While the applicants' claims exclude the dimer acid hydrophobic component of van der Wouden's polyester polyols, it's obvious that the hydrophobic components of Magnus (col. 8) would lower the polarity of his polyesters as effectively as the dimer acid of van der Wouden. The Figure 3 of van der Wouden shows that at least 4% by weight of hydrocarbons can be blended with polyesters higher in polarity.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachel Gorr whose telephone number is (703) 308-3608. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. from 7:30 to 6:00.

Art Unit: 1711

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck, can be reached on (703) 308-2462. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-5408.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

R.G.

Feb. 16, 2000


RACHEL GORR
PRIMARY EXAMINER
